

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/662,931	09/16/2003	Michael Curtiss	0026-0038	2735	
44989 HARRITY SN	7590 01/08/200 YDER, LLP	7	EXAMINER		
11350 Random Hills Road			PARDO, THUY N		
SUITE 600 FAIRFAX, VA	22030		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,		•	2165		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS		01/08/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/662,931	CURTISS ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thuy N. Pardo	2165	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	1		
Period for Reply	,		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		•	
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 D	ecember 2006		
	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		ers, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	*	•	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the application			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw		•	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			٠
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		but the Function	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc			•
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			•
	tarrinor. Note the attacret	· Office Action of form 1 10-132.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.	·	
2. Certified copies of the priority document		pplication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
application from the International Bureau			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not	received.	
	•		
Attachment(s)			
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗖 Intonio s	umman (PTO 442)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		formal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)	•	

Application/Control Number: 10/662,931 Page 2

Art Unit: 2165

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

- 2. Applicant's Amendment filed on December 12, 2006 has been entered and reviewed.
- Claims 1, 8-10 and 29 have been amended, and claims 32 and 33 have been added.
- 3. The indicated allowability of claims 4, 11-28 and 30 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Doganata et al. US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220913. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.
- 4. Claims 1-33 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2165

5. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford et al. (Hereinafter "Ford") US Patent application No. 2005/0289140 in view of Doganata et al. (Hereinafter "Doganata") US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220913.

As to claim 1, Ford teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising: receiving a list of links [a list of URLs results, 167 of fig. 1, 4; 0053]; identifying, for at least one of the links, a source with which the link is associated

["abc.com", "def.com", etc., 167 of fig. 1; 0062]; and

ranking the list of links based at least in part on a quality of the identified sources [score, 170 of fig. 1; 0034].

ranking the link list of links based at least in p[art on a quality of the identified source [170 of fig. 1; 0061], the ranking including:

retrieving a source rank value for each identified source, the source rank value being based at least in part on one or more of a number of articles produced by the identified source during a first time period, an average length of an article produced by the identified source, an amount of important coverage that the identified source produces in a second time period, a breaking news score, an amount of network traffic to the identified source, a human opinion of the news source, circulation statistics of the identified source, a size of a staff associated with the identified source, a number of original named entities in a group of articles associated with the identified source, a breadth of coverage by the identified source, a number of different countries from which network traffic to the identified source originates, and a writing style used by the identified source [weighting applied]

Art Unit: 2165

to each term of a multiple term query is inversely related to the term's frequency of appearance in the database, 0033]; and

However, Ford does not explicitly teach that the identified source is a new source. Doganata teaches that the identified source is a new source [information source, ab; ranked list of information sources, fig. 5-6; 0011; 0040-0047].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the features of Doganata to Ford's system as an essential means to allow users to search through a massive amount of information from different information sources, thereby, provide users with more meaningful search results from different information sources.

As to claim 8, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1, therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 9, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches a memory and a processor [0026-0028; 140-147 of fig. 1].

As to claim 10, all limitations of this claim have been addressed in the analysis above, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

As to claim 11, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed, Ford further teaches determining one or more metric values for the news source based at least in part on at least one of a number of articles produced by the news source during a first time period, an

Art Unit: 2165

average length of an article produced by the news source, an amount of important coverage that the news source produces in a second time period, a breaking news score, an amount of network traffic to the news source, a human opinion of the news source, circulation statistics of the news source, a size of a staff associated with the news source, a number of bureaus associated with the news source, a number of original named entities in a group of articles associated with the news source, a breadth of coverage by the news source, a number of different countries from which network traffic to the news source originates, and a writing style used by the news source [weighting applied to each term of a multiple term query is inversely related to the term's frequency of appearance in the database, 0033]; and

generating a quality value for the news source based at least in part on the determined one or more metric values [170 of fig. 1; 0061].

As to claims 27-29, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As to claim 2, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches identifying the source based at least in part on a uniform resource locator (URL) associated with the link [167 of fig. 1; 0062].

As to claim 3, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches that at least some of the identified sources are news sources [410-430 of fig. 4].

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 6, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches that the links include links to on-line news articles [380 of fig. 3; 0056].

As to claim 7, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches determining the list of links based at least in part on one or more of a search query, a topic, a list of one or more keywords, a geographical area, and a set of documents [0042].

As to claim 13, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches multiplying each metric value in the plurality of metric values by a factor to create a plurality of adjusted metric values, and adding the plurality of adjusted metric values to obtain the quality value [0060-0063; 0141-0143].

As to claim 14, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches that the plurality of metric values includes a predetermined number of highest metric values for the news source [top search results, 0048; 305 of fig. 3].

As to claim 15, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches normalizing each metric value in the plurality of metric values, and adding the plurality of normalized metric values to obtain the quality value [additional matches and related products, 350, 380 of fig. 3; 0048; 0041].

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 17, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches adding the plurality of metric values for the news source to produce a total value, obtaining the quality value by dividing the total value by a quantity of metric values in the plurality of metric values [0157; 0162; 0164].

As to claim 18, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches that the plurality of metric values includes a predetermined number of highest metric values for the news source [0082; 0093].

As to claim 19, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches determining, for each metric value in the plurality of metric values, a percentile score relative to a highest value for that metric, adding the percentile scores to obtain the quality value [0034-0037].

As to claim 21, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches determining and generating for a plurality of other sources, at least one of the plurality of other sources including a different news source and storing the quality values for the news source and the plurality of other sources [0010; 0034; 167 of fig. 1].

As to claim 23, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches determining an importance metric value representing the amount of important coverage that the news source produces in a second time period, and wherein the determining an

Art Unit: 2165

importance metric includes: determining, for each article produced by the news source during the second time period, a number of other non-duplicate articles on a same subject produced by other

news sources to produce an importance value for the article, and adding the importance values to

obtain the importance metric value [0073; 0161-0165].

value based at least in part on the comparing [0081-0084; fig. 5].

As to claim 24, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches identifying, for at least one article produced by the news source, a first time value at which the at least one article was published by the news source, identifying a second time value that an initial article published on a same subject as the at least one article, subtracting the second time value from the first time value to determine a difference time value, comparing the difference time value to a threshold value, and assigning a value to the breaking news metric

As to claim 25, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches identifying a group of articles from other news sources that are on a same subject as the at least one article, multiplying the value by a quantity proportional to a size of the group of articles from the other news sources prior to assigning the value to the breaking news metric value [0150-0153].

As to claim 26, Ford and Doganata teach the invention substantially as claimed. Ford further teaches determining the one or more metric values, non-duplicate articles are weighted differently than duplicate articles [0153; 0160; fig. 9].

As to claims 4, 5, 12, 16, 20, 22, 30, 31, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

- 6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Pardo whose telephone number is 571-272-4082. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

January 04, 2007

THUY N. PARDO PRIMARY EXAMINER